

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON

Year-7 Evaluation of Institutional Effectiveness



Table of Contents

Institutional Overview	4
Preface	5
Institutional Mission	6
1.A.1	6
Improving Institutional Effectiveness.....	7
1.B.1	7
1.B.2	13
1.B.3	14
1.B.4	15
Student Learning	18
1.C.1	18
1.C.2	18
1.C.3	19
1.C.4	20
1.C.5	20
1.C.6	22
1.C.7	24
1.C.8	26
1.C.9	26
Student Achievement	29
1.D.1	29
1.D.2	31
1.D.3	32
1.D.4	33
Addendum to Year 7 EIE Report – Response to Year 6 PRFR Evaluation	36

Institutional Overview

Founded in 1876, the [University of Oregon](#) (UO) is a four-year public, primarily residential tier-1 research institution known for its strong research portfolio, its focus on providing a comprehensive liberal arts education to its students, and its quality liberal arts and professional degree programs. The university consists of eight schools and colleges, the Phil and Penny Knight Campus for Accelerating Scientific Impact, and the Ballmer Institute for Children's Behavioral Health, which collectively offer more than 315 degree and certificate programs. In 1969, the university was admitted into the exclusive membership of the Association of American Universities, an organization of leading research institutions devoted to maintaining a strong system of academic research and education. UO was a member of the Pac-12 and its predecessors since 1915 and joined the Big Ten Conference in the academic year 2024-25. With this move, the UO joins sixteen other AAU member schools to be a member of the largest and most prestigious academic alliance in the country, [the Big Ten Academic Alliance](#).

At the time of this report, UO serves 23,202 students, with an average entering high school GPA of 3.76, who hail from all fifty states and more than one hundred countries. 36% of the 2023 freshman class belong to racial and ethnic minority groups, 14% are first-generation college students, and 31% are eligible for Federal Pell Grants. Approximately 17% of UO students are transfer students, which reflects a decline for the institution that largely tracks the decline in community college enrollment in the state of Oregon over the last few years. 85% of the 2022 freshman class were retained to the second year. 57% of the 2019 entering cohort graduated in four years and 71% of the 2017 entering cohort graduated in six years. The institution's students are supported by approximately 2,000 teaching and research faculty at a 19:1 teaching faculty-to-student ratio and a median class size of twenty-three students.

Most undergraduate and graduate students attend classes and complete programs at the main campus in Eugene, Oregon. The [UO Portland campus](#) hosts graduate programs in law, journalism, business, design, education, and one undergraduate program at the [Ballmer Institute for Children's Behavioral Health](#). UO Portland has been transitioning to its new location in Northeast Portland after UO purchased the campus from the former Concordia University in 2022. All UO Portland programs are expected to complete the transition by fall 2024. UO also hosts undergraduate students majoring in marine biology for three terms and graduate students affiliated with labs associated with the [Oregon Institute of Marine Biology](#) at its Charleston location on the Oregon coast.

The UO is led by its 19th president, John Karl Scholz, who joined the institution in July 2023. Former president Michael H. Schill served as president from 2015 to 2022. While there was a period of stability in the president's office during this accreditation cycle, the Office of the Provost saw more turnover for a variety of reasons. Between 2017 and 2024 there were four provosts with two of those serving as interim provosts. The UO announced its most recent provost hire, Christopher P. Long, on April 16, 2024. Provost Long began his term on June 1, 2024.

This report primarily addresses the academic years 2017-18 through 2023-24. However, given recent and substantial leadership changes in the president and provost positions, the university is at a pivotal moment and currently engaged in a comprehensive strategic planning process. This process, called [UO Onward](#), will redefine or refocus priorities, define key performance indicators (KPIs) and leading indicators, articulate strategies and tactics to meet targets, and articulate the institutional structures and resources needed to execute the plan. The status of that planning process is reflected in this report.

Preface

Changes Since Last Seven-year Review

Since the Year 7 Report in March of 2017, there have been several changes in senior leadership.

President

- July 2023 – present: Karl Scholz
- March 2023 – July 2023 – Jamie Moffitt (interim)
- August 2022 – March 2023 – Patrick Phillips (interim)
- July 2015 – August 2022: Michael H. Schill

Provost and Senior Vice President

- June 2023 – present: Christopher P. Long
- December 2023 – June 2023: Karen Ford (interim)
- August 2022 – December 2023: Janet Woodruff-Borden (interim)
- July 2019 – August 2022: Patrick Phillips
- July 2017 – July 2019: Jayanth Banavar
- July 2013 – July 2017: Scott Coltrane

Outstanding Findings

The UO has nine outstanding findings from its Year 6 PRFR report. These are addressed in an addendum to this report.

New Degree Programs Approved Since March 2017

- Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Science in Environmental Design
- Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Science in Child Behavioral Health
- Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Science in Native American and Indigenous Studies
- Bachelor of Science in Cybersecurity
- Master of Arts in Language Teaching Studies
- Master of Science in Immersive Media Communication
- Accelerated Masters of Nonprofit Management
- Educational Specialist in Educational Leadership
- PhD in Spanish
- PhD in Data-driven Music Performance and Composition

Standard One - Student Success, and Institutional Mission and Effectiveness

The University of Oregon articulates its commitment to student success, primarily measured through student learning and achievement, for all students, with a focus on equity and closure of achievement gaps, and establishes a mission statement, acceptable thresholds, and benchmarks for effectiveness with meaningful indicators. The institution's programs are consistent with its mission and culminate in identified student outcomes leading to degrees, certificates, credentials, employment, or transfer to other higher education institutions or programs. Programs are systematically assessed using meaningful indicators to assure currency, improve teaching and learning strategies, and achieve stated student learning outcomes for all students, including underrepresented students and first-generation college students.

Institutional Mission

1.A.1 – *The institution’s mission statement defines its broad educational purposes and its commitment to student learning and achievement.*

The [university’s mission statement](#) was [approved](#) by its then new [Board of Trustees](#) in 2014 after a collaborative, campus-wide process, and defines the university’s broad educational purposes and its commitment to student learning and achievement.

Serving the State, Nation, and World Since 1876

The University of Oregon is a comprehensive public research university committed to exceptional teaching, discovery, and service. We work at a human scale to generate big ideas. As a community of scholars, we help individuals question critically, think logically, reason effectively, communicate clearly, act creatively, and live ethically.

Purpose

We strive for excellence in teaching, research, artistic expression, and the generation, dissemination, preservation, and application of knowledge. We are devoted to educating the whole person, and to fostering the next generation of transformational leaders and informed participants in the global community. Through these pursuits, we enhance the social, cultural, physical, and economic well-being of our students, Oregon, the nation, and the world.

Vision

We aspire to be a preeminent and innovative public research university encompassing the humanities and arts, the natural and social sciences, and the professions. We seek to enrich the human condition through collaboration, teaching, mentoring, scholarship, experiential learning, creative inquiry, scientific discovery, outreach, and public service.

Values

- *We value the passions, aspirations, individuality, and success of the students, faculty, and staff who work and learn here.*
- *We value academic freedom, creative expression, and intellectual discourse.*
- *We value our diversity and seek to foster equity and inclusion in a welcoming, safe, and respectful community.*
- *We value the unique geography, history, and culture of Oregon that shapes our identity and spirit.*
- *We value our shared charge to steward resources sustainably and responsibly.*

The mission statement reflects the institution’s commitment to “exceptional teaching, discovery, and service,” and in the first paragraph defines the core institutional learning outcomes. The “purpose” section sets the standard for excellence in research and scholarship, and a focus on student success in asserting the commitment to “educating the whole person.” Among other things, the values statements define the institution’s pledge to value diversity and foster equity and inclusion.

These goals and values are reflected throughout the institution and this report, but two examples are cited here.

As a result of participation in a special project for the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities in its last Year 7 report and visit, the university embarked on an effort to update its general education program and identify institutional learning outcomes. This is discussed in more detail later in the report, but the important point for this section is that the renamed [Core Education](#) learning outcomes, called “[Methods of Inquiry](#),” were drawn directly from the mission statement.

These are:

- Critical Thinking
- Creative Thinking
- Written Communication
- Ethical Reflection

A second example of the university's commitment to student learning and achievement, as reflected in the mission statement, is its focus on developing exemplary teaching practices among faculty and graduate employees. The Office of the Provost has worked over the past several years with the University Senate and the faculty union, United Academics, to identify university [teaching standards](#), and establish policies and systems for developing, evaluating, and rewarding faculty in ways that are aligned with these standards. These standards and approach to evaluating teaching were [approved by the University Senate](#) in December of 2021. A critical part of this effort involved redesigning the student feedback portion of teaching evaluation to address known biases in student feedback and aligning the feedback with the teaching standards. Of particular note in the standards is a focus on inclusive teaching, reflecting the institution's commitment to the core value of fostering equity and inclusion.

Improving Institutional Effectiveness

1.B.1 - *The institution demonstrates a continuous process to assess institutional effectiveness, including student learning and achievement and support services. The institution uses an ongoing and systematic evaluation and planning process to inform and refine its effectiveness, assign resources, and improve student learning and achievement.*

The institution engages in continuous processes to assess and refine institutional effectiveness at the university, division, and unit levels. Planning processes incorporate information from assessment and analysis of data, and environmental scans to develop robust interventions and improvements and allocate resources.

University Level: UO Onward Strategic Planning Process

In July 2023, Karl Scholz began his tenure as the UO president. President Scholz immediately began working with the UO Board of Trustees and campus constituents to create a set of goals, objectives, and indicators to guide the university's future work to fulfill its mission and improve institutional effectiveness. After initial conversations, President Scholz launched the institution's strategic planning process, titled "[UO Onward](#)".

This strategic engagement has involved relevant constituents including students, faculty, staff, alumni, donors, and more. After twenty-five in-person and Zoom input sessions, over 2,500 comments from online input and nine weeks of meetings for four focused "Goal Teams", the following priorities and KPIs were identified:

1. Enhance pathways to timely graduation.

KPIs:

- Four-year graduation rates
- Six-year graduation rates
- Four-year and six-year graduation equity gaps
- Retention to second year with disaggregation (race/ethnicity, Pell eligibility, first-generation, transfer)

2. Be a leader among the nation's public research universities in career preparation.

KPI:

- Percent of recent completers with positive outcomes within six months of completing
3. Create a flourishing community.
KPIs:
 - Percent of flourishing employees
 - Percent of flourishing students
 4. Innovate for societal impact. This goal is focused on elevating scholarship, research, creative work, and programs that reflect the UO's unique strengths and capabilities. KPIs will be developed for these areas at a later date. Key areas of focus include:
 - Environmental Resilience
 - Mental Health and Well-being
 - Human Performance and Sport
 - Accelerating the Impact of Science on Society

The next phase of UO Onward commenced in July 2024 and charged units and divisions with developing tactics and indicators of success aligned to KPIs, resulting in a five-year strategic plan for the university. The strategic plan will be executed through the university's organizational and committee structures with oversight by the president's Executive Planning Group comprised of vice presidents, vice provosts, deans, and directors. Resource allocation related to strategic priorities occurs through the university's resource allocation processes, described in the next section.

University Level: Resource Assessment and Allocation

Routine university resource allocation is done for the schools and colleges through the [academic allocation model](#). A base-plus budget model is used for administrative units with incremental adjustments generally flowing through a structured annual [Strategic Investment Process](#). The academic allocation model is a dynamic budget allocation model that, at the direction of the provost, allocates general fund resources to the schools and colleges. Resources from the academic allocation process are categorized into two separate categories: formulaic and strategic. Both components allow for schools and colleges to operate with minimal financial risk and for the provost to strategically allocate resources.

The formulaic components of the allocation are driven directly by salary and other payroll expense (OPE) needs of the tenure-track faculty and graduate employees, as well as pass-through of summer tuition and graduate tuition revenue. Funding for graduate employees is allocated by the provost based on program quality metrics and teaching need. Resources for tenure-line faculty are determined via an [institutional hiring plan](#), an annual process in which schools and colleges request authority to hire tenure-track faculty via proposals submitted to deans and then to the provost.

Prior to AY 2017-18, tenure-related hires were managed by deans' offices and primarily based on a replacement model with some consideration for school/college strategic priorities. Because tenure lines are a significant and long-term investment by the university, it was decided that allocation for those hires needed more central oversight and strategic alignment. The institutional hiring plan was created at that time and tenure lines were moved to the Office of the Provost for management and oversight.

Proposals for tenure-related faculty lines are now evaluated based on their alignment with the university's strategic priorities as they relate to the institution's research and teaching mission. Once a line is approved, full funding for salary and OPE is provided to the school or college through the academic allocation model by the Office of the Provost.

Strategic components within the academic allocation model include the general operation allocation which varies based on programmatic need by college. This is especially true for specialized faculty and facilities

in the professional schools and single and multi-year program investments negotiated between the Office of the Provost and a specific college. Expectations related to program investments are outlined through an annual allocation memo.

Additionally, the Office of the Provost uses a series of [operational metrics](#) to evaluate the operating efficiency and effectiveness of schools and colleges. These metrics, which include information such as student credit hours per faculty, total cost per student credit hour, the distribution of course head count, among others, inform both the academic allocation process and the institutional hiring plan to assign resources to academic units. The comprehensive operational metrics reports allow the institution to evaluate whether the level of resources is appropriate for any given academic unit based on their teaching demands and unique pedagogy.

The strategic components of administrative and academic allocation run through the president's [Strategic Investment Process](#). This is a structured process by which units across the university identify their needs and submit funding requests. These are evaluated by a diverse cross-campus working group made up of faculty, staff, students, and senior administrators. The group provides a recommendation to the president. This includes one-time and ongoing budget requests.

Division Level

Ongoing planning and evaluation processes at the division level are managed through standard reporting lines and processes. Vice presidents and vice provosts are responsible for establishing goals, objectives, and indicators of effectiveness that are aligned with university strategic priorities and indicators. Divisions then engage in planning and evaluation processes to determine effectiveness and inform resource allocation through the processes described in the previous section, with accountability to the president and/or provost as appropriate. Two divisions are highlighted in the following sections.

Division Level: Student Life

The Division of Student Life includes the Office of the Dean of Students, the Erb Memorial Union, the Department of Physical Education and Recreation, and the University Career Center, as well as six functional areas that report through the vice president's office: assessment and research, major student events, financial services, human resources, parent and family programs, and student government engagement and success. In addition, the vice president serves as the central administration liaison to the recognized student government, the Associated Students of the University of Oregon (ASUO). The division has a central focus on student well-being and expanding learning beyond the classroom.

The Division of Student Life [Office of Assessment and Research](#) manages an ongoing, multicohort, longitudinal research program designed to holistically understand institutional inputs to undergraduate students' well-being and success across the college experience called the [Student Well-Being and Success Initiative](#) (SWaSI).

SWaSI is an educational program designed to improve well-being and success outcomes, especially among historically marginalized populations (e.g., first-generation students, Black students). It also serves as an assessment and evaluation program designed to gauge the effectiveness of programmatic activities. Evaluations are used to improve institutional practices that support students' learning and development and foster their achievement and persistence. The Student Well-Being and Success Initiative is led by the Assistant Director of the [Office of Assessment and Research](#) in the [Division of Student Life](#). It is supported primarily by the Office of the Vice President for Student Life with integral support from units of the Division of Student Life – the [Department of Physical Education and Recreation](#), the [Erb Memorial Union](#), and the [Office of the Dean of Students](#) – and across campus from the Divisions of [Undergraduate Education and Student Success](#), [Student Services and Enrollment Management](#), and [Global Engagement](#), as well as the [UO](#)

[Libraries.](#)

Data obtained through SWaSI is used to evaluate the experience of specific student populations. For example, the initiative revealed that 46.5% of the 2023-24 undergraduate student cohort reported [having a disability or being neurodivergent](#), and that undergraduates with disabilities or neurodivergence tend to show up lower on [well-being measures](#). In part, this has spurred collaboration between the [Digital Accessibility office](#), the [Teaching Engagement Program](#) (TEP), the [Accessible Education Center](#), and Student Life to advocate and provide resources for addressing the accessibility needs of these students. The [Student Well-being Toolkit](#) was developed by TEP as part of this collaboration. This is one example of using SWaSI data to mitigate gaps in achievement and make programmatic determinations that may have the most positive impact on student success.

Within the Division of Student Life, budgets are set annually for each department. New programs and initiatives are considered for funding based on assessment including demonstrated need, data/research on the impact of the program/service to targeted student groups, and service gap analysis. Continued funding is based on an assessment of program effectiveness and participant feedback. For student success, the division regularly reviews the service delivery and service levels through service data and impact analysis, programmatic assessment, and student feedback.

The division invests in the core services and evidence-based practices that support student experience and achievement. The division employs program assessment annually or on a program cycle, to inform the programmatic effectiveness and impacts on student achievement outcomes, program goals, and student experiences. Service delivery and service levels are monitored according to service demands and enrollment, which informs resource allocation within the divisional budget. Resource requests to the Office of the Provost or the university may be made for increased support needs or a new program aligned to the strategic priorities. Those requests are not systematic and done on an as-needed basis, or through the institutional strategic investment process.

Division Level: [Undergraduate Education and Student Success](#)

[The Division of Undergraduate Education and Student Success \(UESS\)](#) stewards the undergraduate culture of inquiry at the heart of a preeminent residential research university. UESS promotes academic excellence and engagement, access, and “success” and supports “the coherence, relevance, and impact of our students’ educational journeys.” The division includes advising, accessible education, first-year programs, undergraduate curriculum and academic support, undergraduate research and distinguished scholarships, and student success initiatives. Through its ongoing planning process, the division recently established a new definition of [student success](#) aligned with university priorities: “Our students will graduate from the University of Oregon having had a positive experience, and will be well-educated, socially responsible, and career ready.” Underpinning the division’s work is a focus on addressing equity gaps and enhancing inclusion.

UESS has invested in the programs and services that support historically underserved student populations and have a positive impact on their success. The division expanded [PathwayOregon](#), a nationally recognized scholarship and wraparound support program that serves academically qualified low-income Oregon residents. The division collaborates with the [Division of Equity and Inclusion](#) and the [Center for Academic and Multicultural Excellence](#), which supports historically underserved and underrepresented students. In addition, UESS operates [Trio Student Support Services](#), serving low income, first-generation, and/or students with disabilities, the [Accessible Education Center](#) serving students with disabilities, the [Office of Academic Advising](#) serving students on academic warning/probation or with high needs, the [McNair scholars program](#) supporting students who are low income and/or historically underrepresented in higher education, and [Academic Residential Communities](#) offering identity-based residential communities for various identity groups (e.g. Women in Science and Math, Latinx Scholars, LGBTQIA+ Scholars, Native

American and Indigenous Studies).

As part of institutional and divisional assessment and planning, UESS implemented several new initiatives over the past two years. A [second tutoring and academic support](#) service hub was added in a residence hall in 2021 to bring academic support services to students and increase access to academic support services. The [Summer Bridge](#) program was implemented in 2021 to help traditionally underserved students' transition to college, with support from funding from the state of Oregon. A new cohort-based career development program, [DucksRISE](#), was started in 2022 for traditionally marginalized students to provide career exploration and development opportunities and experiential learning experiences. The [Home Flight Scholars Program](#), administered through Center for Multicultural Academic Excellence, was launched in 2022 to support Native American students. Finally, the division is investing in four additional access advisors in the Accessible Education Center to serve an increased number of students needing accommodations for disabilities.

Through these efforts, the division contributed to an 8.3% increase in four-year graduation rates between 2014-2022, supported 2,400 students in first-year programs, and encouraged 3,840 students to participate in the Undergraduate Research Symposium. These and many other accomplishments are highlighted in the UESS [2022-23 Annual Report](#).

Academic Unit Level

Ongoing planning and evaluation processes at the academic unit level are managed through standard reporting lines and processes. Deans, academic directors, and department/program heads are responsible for establishing goals, objectives, and indicators of effectiveness that are aligned with school/college and university strategic priorities and indicators. These units then engage in planning and evaluation processes to determine effectiveness and inform resource allocation through the processes described in the previous section on resource allocation. Deans are accountable to the provost and senior vice president for reporting on goals and indicators of success. The academic program assessment process is described in the next section.

Academic Unit Level: Academic Program Assessment

The primary continuous process to assess institutional effectiveness regarding student learning and achievement at the academic unit level is academic [program assessment](#), which integrates [annual assessment](#) with [decennial program review](#). In 2018, decennial program review was paused so that it could be redesigned to provide more value to units and align more closely with university priorities. Just prior to launching the newly revised process, COVID-19 put a halt to that effort. In 2021, a new provost called for even more revisions to the process, resulting in another complete redesign. The current process was created and launched in 2022.

The previous decennial program review process was heavily weighted on research and disconnected from student learning and achievement and annual program assessment. The new decennial program review approach weights equally the institution's mission-based focus on research with student learning and achievement and aligns with annual program assessment. The new approach also creates efficiencies by more closely tying program review with professional accreditation so that those units do not have to duplicate efforts. Together, these two unit-based activities comprise program assessment, graphically depicted below.

Program Assessment



*External Review Committee (ERC)/Internal Review Committee (IRC); Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs); Student Achievement Goals (SAGs)

Program assessment functions on a ten-year timeline that includes eight years of annual program assessment and two years of decennial program review. Program assessment is grounded in the following [principles](#) at the UO. Program assessment is:

- **Meaningful to academic units** with goals that align with unit values, created through a collaborative approach.
- **Rightsized** with clear guidelines allowing units to be incremental and efficient.
- **Action-oriented** leading to programmatic changes rather than just documentation and reflection.
- **Data-informed** using data to identify areas for improvement and track progress, but also recognizing that faculty expertise is a valuable form of data for assessment.
- **Faculty-driven** so faculty have input into and know what goals they are working toward.
- **Institutionally aligned** considering university-level goals and priorities when identifying unit-level goals, priorities, and actions.
- **Focused on continuous improvement** through honest, on-going self-reflection that leads to action.
- **Equity-minded** focusing on closing equity gaps where they exist.
- **Systemic** focusing on building sustainable processes for improvement that don't rely on individual faculty alone.

Units enact these principles by establishing student program learning outcomes (PLOs) and student achievement goals (SAGs) and assessing those PLOs and SAGs continuously. Assessments are data-informed, action-oriented, and rightsized to encourage continuous improvement. This process assesses institutional effectiveness and identifies areas for improvement in relation to student learning and student achievement. Deans and academic directors are responsible to the Office of the Provost for ensuring that student learning and achievement outcomes are assessed and reported annually through this process. Resources are allocated accordingly through the academic allocation process described above.

1.B.2 - *The institution sets and articulates meaningful goals, objectives, and indicators of its goals to define mission fulfillment and to improve its effectiveness in the context of and in comparison with regional and national peer institutions.*

As noted in 1.B.1, the first phase of the UO Onward strategic planning process resulted in four strategic goals and KPIs related to mission fulfillment that will inform unit planning across the institution in the coming academic year 2024-25. Units will be charged with setting local indicators aligned with university indicators and developing plans to align unit work with institutional goals. When relevant, unit-level leading indicators will be compared to peers to help units set targets and measure effectiveness.

UO routinely compares itself to [peer institutions](#) when making strategic decisions, including Pac-12, and now Big Ten institutions, national and regional comparators, and the AAU public institutions. These comparators inform the assessment of success indicators for student achievement, research and teaching, and program development.

Student Achievement

The institution monitors and makes available [peer comparator data](#) for retention rates, four- and six-year graduation rates, actual vs. predicted six-year graduation rates based on the [U.S. News and World Report formula](#), and predicted vs. actual retention rates based on high school GPA. These data sets are used to compare UO student outcomes with national and regional peers to inform institutional decision-making, especially concerning indicators of effectiveness for student achievement and resource allocation.

Peer comparisons are integrated into the tuition and fee setting process through a systematic review of in-state and out-of-state tuition levels of both Pac-12 and AAU publics ensuring that the institution remains competitive, accessible, and fiscally responsible. The [February 12, 2024, recommendation to the president](#) from the [Tuition and Fee Advisory Board](#) provides an example of such an analysis on page six.

Research and Teaching

As described in 1.B.1, program assessment is the primary method academic units use to set goals and indicators of success in the context of peer institutions. First, units are provided continual access to student achievement data benchmarked against peers as described in the previous section and in 1.C.5. These data inform both annual assessment and decennial program review. In the [self-study for decennial program review](#), units are asked to identify program-related peer comparators and benchmark performance against those comparators. In addition, the peer review process includes an external review team that is charged with providing evaluation and feedback of the unit in comparison to discipline standards and peers.

Program Development

As of 2023, all proposed new degree programs are required to provide a report analyzing labor market prospects and peer competitor data for the program. These data are provided by the Office of the Provost through its contract with [Lightcast](#), and serve to inform refinement of curriculum and learning outcomes that align with industry standards.

Reevaluation of Peer Institutions

While the institution has routinely used peer comparators to inform planning and decision-making in a variety of contexts, the institution's move to the Big Ten conference makes this an opportune time to reevaluate those comparators. One result of the UO Onward planning process described in 1.B.1 will be to identify a set of peers that are aligned with the institution's student population and newly identified student achievement KPIs.

1.B.3 - *The institution provides evidence that its planning process is inclusive and offers opportunities for comment by appropriate constituencies, allocates necessary resources, and leads to improvement of institutional effectiveness.*

As mentioned in 1.B.1, the [UO Onward](#) strategic planning process began in fall 2023 with broad campus and community engagement. At the onset, a broad set of institutional priorities and a draft set of goals were shared with members of the UO community. Input was collected from twenty-five live (in-person and Zoom) sessions and a Qualtrics survey made available to all constituents. The input addressed two types of information related to the priorities and draft goals: 1) Questions and concerns, and 2) strategies and ideas. A team analyzed and organized the feedback from the twenty-five sessions and over 2,500 online comments to inform the subsequent stages of planning. As a result of the initial feedback, the original three priorities and ten goals were streamlined into four goals.

During the second phase of the process, four “goal teams” were formed to further develop the goals, KPIs, and tactics. Each goal team was comprised of twelve to thirteen faculty, staff, and administrators from across campus, with each team supported by a central data team. These goal teams considered the summarized feedback, reviewed best practices, and followed a set of planning principles in finalizing their recommendations to the president’s University Leadership Team.

- The goal teams adhered to these planning principles which, among other things, reflect the institution’s commitment to an inclusive planning process:
- If everything is a priority, then nothing is a priority.
- Because campus-wide buy-in and ownership of our priorities is critical to our success, we will take into account the input gathered from the community in the fall term.
- We will balance the decentralized nature of the university with the need for centralized priorities and structures. For our institutional strategic priorities, school/college deans will be particularly important stakeholders.
- Our proposed tactics, strategies, and KPIs should be research-informed.
- We will consider our current state as an institution, recognizing our challenges, and leveraging our existing strengths as a university when prioritizing strategies.
- Not only new ideas but also improvements to existing functions, structures, and processes are to be considered as valid strategies if they help us meet the assigned goal(s).
- We will listen and consider our unique units and perspectives but put the good of the institution first.
- Our proposed tactics, strategies, and KPIs will reflect our commitment to diversity, equity, inclusion, and the public good.

Phase three of the process in the spring and summer of 2024 involved an additional round of input from the campus community. Constituents were invited to provide feedback on the revised set of goals and KPIs through a survey. This feedback was used to inform the next stage of the planning process, which is focused on alignment of unit-level work to university goals and KPIs.

The culmination of this planning process will be a charge to university units to align local plans, indicators, and resources with the university strategic plan. These plans and their contributions to institutional effectiveness will be managed and resourced through the university’s organizational and leadership structure.

Inclusive planning for academic matters is also supported through shared governance processes with the [University Senate](#) and the [Faculty Advisory Council](#). The University Senate at the UO is an inclusive body with representation from faculty, students, staff, officers of administration, officers of research, and

librarians. The statutory faculty, as defined in the [Constitution of the University of Oregon](#), have delegated authority to the University Senate. Senate leadership meets regularly with the president and senior leadership to collaborate on important issues affecting the institution. Academic policies and programs are approved through the University Senate and its committees.

The Faculty Advisory Council is an elected committee consisting of faculty and officers of administration that serves in a purely advisory role to the president and senior administration. Because this body is not authorized to conduct business or make policy, it is exempt from the university's open committee meeting rules and thus can provide frank advice to the president and senior leadership on critical issues.

The [Officers of Administration Council](#) represents officers of administration at UO and works with university leadership on issues relevant to that group of employees.

Finally, the university is home to six labor unions:

- [United Academics](#) (UA) – represents all faculty.
- [Graduate Teaching Fellows Federation](#) (GTFF) – represents all graduate employees.
- [Service Employees International Union](#) (SEIU) – represents classified staff.
- [University of Oregon Police Association](#) (UOPA) – represents all sworn police officers and campus dispatchers.
- [Teamsters](#) – represents a small group of trade professionals in the university's printing and mailing services.
- [UO Student Workers](#) – newly formed union representing undergraduate student employees.

Through collective bargaining and ongoing joint labor/management meetings, [Employee and Labor Relations](#) works with these representative groups to support the university's mission and strategic initiatives.

These inclusive planning processes and structures inform the strategic resource allocation described in 1.B.1 and provide necessary input to help evaluate and refine institutional effectiveness.

1.B.4 - *The institution monitors its internal and external environments to identify current and emerging patterns, trends, and expectations. Through its governance system it considers such findings to assess its strategic position, define its future direction, and review and revise, as necessary, its mission, planning, intended outcomes of its programs and services, and indicators of achievement of its goals.*

The institution's internal and external environments are routinely monitored through its governance system and divisional and unit processes. Information from these processes is reviewed and discussed at the senior leadership level in the president's executive team and the Board of Trustees to inform strategic directions and revise, as necessary, plans, programs, and services.

Governance Structure

University leadership is responsible to its [Board of Trustees](#), composed of fourteen trustees, all of whom are appointed by the state's governor. The board is given authority under state statute to govern all aspects of the institution though it delegates some of that authority through the [Retention and Delegation of Authority policy](#). In that policy, the faculty (the "president and professors" as defined in state statute) are delegated authority over academic matters, generally understood as curriculum, grading, credits, academic standards, and academic policies. Academic matters are governed through the [University Senate](#) and its [committees](#),

through its own governance processes, and those defined in the policy on [University Policies](#).

The board engages with university leadership regularly on the following topics to ensure the university is effectively carrying out its mission: the university's financial position (quarterly, with an annual review and report presented by an external auditor); research activities (annually); capital planning and projects (annually); academic efforts and initiatives; and university enterprise risk management. The latest board reports with an annual financial review, external audit results, capital plan, and foundation report can be found at <https://trustees.uoregon.edu/sites/default/files/2023-12/00-ffc-consolidated-updated.pdf>.

The president convenes his Executive Planning Group (EPG), comprised of vice presidents and provosts, weekly and the University Leadership Team (ULT), comprised of the EPG and deans, monthly to help ensure that university leaders and their teams are collaboratively attending to operational issues, keeping collectively apprised of internal and external risks as they emerge, and issue responses acting in a timely and effective manner. Members of these teams regularly review internal and external information and data (e.g., data relevant to AAU membership, the results of the 2022 employee climate survey, student basic needs assessments).

The provost has similarly convened a Deans' Council consisting of all the deans and will convene a Provost's Council consisting of deans and vice provosts to focus on academic matters. In addition, the Office of the Provost has over the last two years developed systems and standardization for collecting, monitoring, and enhancing academic program quality and student achievement through the program assessment process described in 1.B.1. Decennial program review invites external reviewers from comparator and aspirational institutions to provide additional perspectives on the external environment, especially as it relates to particular disciplines and programs.

Other units also routinely engage in monitoring of the internal and external environment to inform planning and decision-making.

Internal Audit

The institution's [Office of Internal Audit](#) provides independent and objective evaluations of university units through [financial and performance audits](#). These audits are aimed at providing reasonable assurance that operations are effective and efficient; that financial reporting is reliable; and that our processes and activities are compliant with applicable laws and regulations. Internal audit also offers consulting services to facilitate self-assessments and evaluate changes in policies and procedures and serves as the conduit for a third party-operated fraud and ethics hotline into which employees, students, and external parties may report concerns of unlawful or unethical action on the part of any university constituent or unit. In 2023, the office engaged with an outside firm to support internal auditing. The outside firm provided an [initial report](#) to the board at the June 3, 2024, meeting outlining the first phases of ongoing internal audits.

Risk Management

The office of [Safety and Risk Services](#) supports comprehensive [risk management](#) for the institution through ongoing assessment of internal and external risks. Supporting this work is the [Strategic Enterprise Risk Management and Compliance Committee \(SERMC\)](#) which is made up of the vice presidents or their designees and convenes regularly (approximately once per month) to evaluate, monitor, and mitigate institutional risks, both internal and external. The committee charges working groups of subject matter experts to develop strategies to improve our risk profile in a diversity of areas as needed, that is, when the committee identifies opportunities for improvement. The committee then makes recommendations to the president for implementation of improvement measures and follows up with the responsible parties to ensure completion and accountability. This committee is advisory to the president and reports to the Board of Trustees annually.

Campus Climate

In April 2022, UO contracted with an independent consultant, Gallup, to work with the [Division of Equity and Inclusion](#) to conduct an [IDEAL climate survey](#) involving faculty, staff, temporary employees, and graduate employees. The survey focused on employee engagement, the culture of inclusion and collegiality, institutional equity, personal readiness, and colleague commitment to DEI conversations, onboarding processes, tenure and promotion processes (faculty only), service systems (faculty only), and experiences with discrimination on campus. Gallup provided an early report to the institution in [June 2022](#) and deeper analytics were provided in [fall 2022](#). In spring 2023, vice presidents and deans reviewed school, college, and unit-level information and began developing action plans around university-wide and unit-level work. Gallup's analysis identified several key areas of focus for UO including a need to:

- Improve engagement with employees so they feel even more connected and committed to their work and our mission;
- Enhance collegiality to ensure all feel respected, supported, and valued;
- Ensure employees feel they have equitable access to resources and opportunities; and
- Prevent and address incidents of harassment and discrimination, ensure they are reported, and that those affected receive support and resources.

To address university-wide action, four [working groups](#) were charged with assessing resources, programs, policies, and practices, and recommending improvements or changes. They are working in parallel with and in support of the unit-level efforts to develop tools, programs, and potential policy changes. The working groups have provided updates to senior leaders on their activities and have made initial recommendations. Each group is supported by an administrative unit and includes individuals on campus with expertise, responsibility, and/or involvement in the topic area. They are focused on the following areas:

- [Engagement and onboarding](#)
- [Equity](#)
- [Response, reporting, and anti-discrimination](#)
- [Faculty tenure and promotion, and service](#)

To address unit-level action, vice presidents and deans shared unit-level survey results to allow the leaders in schools, colleges, and divisions to engage in productive and helpful conversations with their faculty, staff, and graduate employees about what's working and what needs improvement, and how to make progress addressing the campus climate survey's findings.

In November 2023, the university hosted the Campus Forum on Belonging, Climate, and Culture, an event open to all campus constituents designed to solicit feedback and input of creating a culture of belonging. Information gathered at the event was given to appropriate climate working groups for action.

Government and Community Relations

The office of [Government and Community Relations](#) reports to the president and monitors federal, state, and local issues, policy and prospective policy to assist in identifying external issues that affect the university. The office regularly reports to the president's leadership team, the board, and hosts a monthly government relations call with constituents across the institution to inform planning and decision-making affected by legislative action. The office also hosts a regularly updated [newsletter](#) available to anyone.

Student Learning

1.C.1 – *The institution offers programs with appropriate content and rigor that are consistent with its mission, culminate in achievement of clearly identified student learning outcomes that lead to collegiate-level degrees, certificates, or credentials and include designators consistent with program content in recognized fields of study.*

The Office of the Provost is responsible for coordination and support of academic programming, including the management of [procedures for new programs and modification to curriculum](#). All proposals for new academic programs and requests for curricular change are subject to [review at multiple levels](#), including school/college-level, external review, university-level, Board of Trustees and state-level, and regional accreditor (NWCCU) review.

New programs are first developed by faculty in the department. Faculty-driven program proposals ensure that programs have the appropriate content and rigor consistent with UO's mission and the discipline and culminate in the achievement of clearly defined student learning outcomes. As of 2023, all proposed new degree programs are required to provide a report analyzing labor market prospects and competitor data for the program. These data are provided by the Office of the Provost through its contract with [Lightcast](#), and serves to inform refinement of curriculum and learning outcomes to align with industry standards and needs.

Programs are required to have program curricula and learning outcomes approved by curriculum committees and documented in CourseLeaf, a software tool that supports the development and review of course and program proposals, as well as in the course catalog (sample learning outcomes for the [BA and BS in Child Behavioral Health](#)). In 2022-23, the Office of the Provost and the Office of the Registrar completed an organized overhaul of program learning outcomes to increase transparency, accuracy, and applicability. The program assessment process described in 1.B.1 is used to provide ongoing assurance that programs are of appropriate content and rigor, are consistent with the institution's mission and culminate in clearly defined student learning outcomes.

In compliance with the US Department of Education and the Oregon Higher Education Coordinating Commission (HECC) for participation in the National Council for State Authorization Reciprocity Agreement (NC-SARA), the UO provides information pertaining to professional licensure and certification in correlation with appropriate UO programs. Professional licensure reporting is updated annually and is overseen by the Office of the Provost. New programs are subject to review by the program manager of professional licensure and all applicable programs are required to report their determinations prior to admitting students or receiving applications. All program licensure information and determinations are posted on a [central website accessible to the public](#). Online programs leading to licensure are cross-listed on a [UO Online webpage](#) and graduate program information is shared through the Slate application with prospective students. This process of ongoing evaluation of curriculum and outcomes for these programs ensures alignment with disciplinary and professional standards.

In addition, [specially accredited programs](#) undergo periodic review by external accrediting bodies. This process, which is aligned with the institution's program assessment process described in 1.B.1, provides an additional method for ensuring alignment of curriculum and learning outcomes with disciplinary and professional standards.

1.C.2 – *The institution awards credit, degrees, certificates, or credentials for programs that are based upon student learning and learning outcomes that offer an appropriate breadth, depth, sequencing, and synthesis of learning.*

UO awards credit, degrees, certificates, and credentials for [more than 300 undergraduate programs and 120 graduate programs](#) across eight schools/colleges (School of Law, College of Arts and Sciences,

School of Journalism and Communication, School of Music and Dance, College of Education, Charles H. Lundquist College of Business, College of Design, Robert D. Clark Honors College), one graduate division, one specialized STEM campus (Phil and Penny Knight Campus for Accelerating Scientific Impact), and one institute (The Ballmer Institute for Children’s Behavioral Health).

As mentioned in 1.C.1., all degree programs have program learning outcomes, which were recently updated in a joint effort between the Office of the Provost and the Office of the Registrar as part of [annual program assessment for AY22-23](#). For all programs, the depth, breadth, sequencing, and synthesis of learning are established through a rigorous, faculty-driven approval process in University Senate committees and the senate itself. Program proposals are required to identify program learning outcomes and where in the curriculum they are introduced, developed, and assessed. Graduate programs are reviewed and recommended to the University Senate for approval by the [Graduate Council](#) and undergraduate programs by the [Undergraduate Council](#).

Continuous oversight of programs happens through ongoing assessment by schools/colleges and departments through the program assessment process described in 1.B.1. Through program assessment, programs and departments reflect on performance and promote continuous improvement particularly in areas of student learning and achievement and with a focus on closing equity gaps where they exist.

As part of this framework, annual assessment provides opportunities to course correct in the short run and decennial program review asks units to examine their strengths and weaknesses, identify challenges and opportunities, and assess their academic and strategic goals over a longer timeline with an implementation plan for improvement. The unit’s reflection and strategic goal setting are driven by analysis of relevant data sets and in alignment with the college/school, and university priorities. Specifically, decennial program review provides a moment for units to:

- Engage in thoughtful reflection and analysis of their strengths and weaknesses in their curricula. (Self-Study template)
- Reflect on the connection and alignment of their work with college/school priorities, and the institutional mission. (Self-Study)
- Receive knowledge and input from the larger context of the discipline and peer programs. (ERC report guidance document)
- Create concrete goals and objectives that should focus the unit’s future work and lead to continuous improvement. At least one goal must focus on student achievement—especially on closing equity gaps where they exist. (Goal Setting and Implementation Plan template)
- Create a plan for assessing Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) and Student Achievement Goals (SAGs) in annual assessment. (Goal Setting and Implementation Plan and Assessment Guidelines).

1.C.3 - *The institution identifies and publishes expected program and degree learning outcomes for all degrees, certificates, and credentials. Information on expected student learning outcomes for all courses is provided to enrolled students.*

As stated previously, degree learning outcomes are published in the [UO Catalog](#). A recent effort in AY 2023-24 required all degree programs to review and update their program learning outcomes.

Every course approved through the [course approval process](#) must define the course learning outcomes and, if applicable, define how the course meets the core education outcomes. These are recorded in the curricular management system, CourseLeaf (sample [CourseLeaf approval form](#)). All instructors of record are required through the university [syllabus policy](#) to state the approved course learning outcomes on the syllabus, including both course-specific outcomes and core education outcomes. In addition, beginning Fall 2024, course information (course description, learning outcomes, core education attributes) from

CourseLeaf is automatically imported into the university's learning management system (LMS) Canvas each time a course is taught. This will ensure that every student has access to the approved course information for their courses independent of the syllabus.

1.C.4 - *The institution's admission and completion or graduation requirements are clearly defined, widely published, and easily accessible to students and the public.*

UO publishes its admissions requirements in the [university catalog](#), which is a widely shared, easily accessible digital and print resource. Admission requirements for new students, transferring students, and more are also listed on the [admissions website](#). For specific programs, such as the [School of Law](#), [American English Institute](#), the [Clark Honors College](#), and the [Division of Graduate Studies](#), information is listed on the general admissions website but is also more detailed on each program webpage. [Admissions policies](#) can be found in the policy library and are currently under revision for AY 24-25. [Undergraduate completion and graduation requirements](#) are published in the catalog and are reiterated in advising materials and on program websites. [Graduate completion and graduation requirements](#) are detailed on the [Division of Graduate Studies](#) website.

During 2022-23, the Office of the Provost and the Office of the Registrar collaborated to improve the catalog including efforts to review and update all program requirements, all program learning outcomes, and all professional licensure reporting information. This work is in preparation for the upcoming (AY 24-25) implementation of [Degree Works](#), which is a complete suite of tools aimed at streamlined degree guidance, degree planning, advising, and degree audits.

Currently, students can use the [UO Degree Guide](#), a web-based program, to view progress toward declared majors, update degree guide (formerly called degree audits), run a "What If" degree guide to determine progress toward a different major, view course history, with options to sort by term, course prefix and number, or grade. The Degree Guide is designed to assist students in course planning and degree tracking. In addition, students coordinate with their school/college and department/unit/area academic advisor to map out degree progress, next steps toward graduation, and review program requirements.

Degree Works will replace the Degree Guide and other tools used across campus by key student-facing offices such as Student Services and Enrollment Management, Student Life, and Undergraduate Education and Student Success. This will create internal alignment around these processes for faculty, staff, and students to improve advising and student self-help with requirements.

1.C.5 - *The institution engages in an effective system of assessment to evaluate the quality of learning in its programs. The institution recognizes the central role of faculty to establish curricula, assess student learning, and improve instructional programs.*

Program assessment as described in section 1.B.1 is the UO's primary process for assessment and evaluation of quality of learning in programs. UO recognizes the central role of faculty to establish curricula, assess student learning, and improve instructional programs by providing faculty with the autonomy to set program learning outcomes and student achievement goals. Faculty establish curricula through processes defined in 1.C.1 and 1.C.2. Faculty also choose relevant assessment methods for their unit with a focus on the improvement of instructional programs. The outcome of these assessment methods is action toward improvement instead of mere data collection.

Assessment of learning is grounded in the principles described in 1.B.1. Ensuring that assessment efforts are meaningful to units, data-informed, and rightsized, the university encourages assessment efforts that focus on actionable continuous improvement. The Office of the Provost provides centralized structures to support program assessment. Specifically, in 2022 the Office of the Provost created central department SharePoint folders that contain the following three to four folders:

- Annual Program Assessment – contains all annual assessment documents.

- Data – contains a variety of data sources including graduate and undergraduate student department profiles, alumni data from Lightcast, and dashboards for grade equity (DFW rates disaggregated), course materials costs, student experience surveys, operational metrics, and disaggregated undergraduate student achievement data.
- Decennial Program Review – contains historical documents for decennial program review.
- Specialized Accreditation – contains specialized accreditation reports where applicable.

These folders are available to anyone in the department and help departments to improve their assessment work with access to higher quality, continuously updated data. The folders also provide an ongoing record of program assessment to provide departmental continuity in these efforts as leadership and faculty come and go.

Program Assessment Examples

Program assessment examples are provided here to highlight the link between annual program assessment and decennial program review in the first example, and to highlight the variety of assessment approaches in the subsequent examples.

Department of Computer Science

The Department of Computer Science completed its decennial program review process in fall of 2023 (the department's folder can be accessed on [SharePoint](#)). In its [self-study](#), computer science identified several core courses with relatively high non-complete rates and equity gaps in those rates. It used the [Grade Equity dashboard](#) to identify these courses. In its [goal-setting and implementation plan](#), the unit established a goal to identify the potential causes of high and inequitable DFNW rates in relevant lower-division courses and develop a plan to reduce DFNW rates and inequities in those courses. The department will form a committee to examine placement practices, instructor preparation, and other potential causes for unwanted and inequitable student outcomes in CS110, 111, 122, 210, 211, 212, among other lower-division courses, and propose a solution to remediate any issues identified.

This priority area from decennial program review became the basis for the unit's Student Achievement Goal as mandated by the Office of the Provost. SAGs were added to annual assessment as a priority in AY 2022-23 and provide a mechanism for annual work and reporting to improve student achievement and equity gaps at the unit level. More about SAGs is described in 1.D.4.

Evidence for annual assessment can also be found in the annual [assessment report](#) in the computer science [undergraduate programs annual assessment folder](#) (2022 is the last report because annual assessment is paused during decennial program review).

Department of Psychology

The Department of Psychology focused its [student achievement goal](#) on a critical course sequence in the major that demonstrated both high non-complete rates and equity gaps. In its early analysis the department focused on incorporating evidence-based inclusive teaching practices in those courses and ways they might improve social belonging in these large courses. The [2021-22 annual PLO assessment report](#) describes its methods for ongoing assessment of program learning outcomes.

Department of History

The Department of History engaged in a more [holistic review of its major](#), focusing on the increasing lack of diversity in the history major and declining majors overall. As a result of critical faculty analysis and discussion, the department is engaged in discussions about broad curriculum review to address these issues.

These examples represent the institution's focus on addressing equity gaps, the variety of approaches to assessment, and the link between annual assessment and decennial program review. These examples also

highlight the core principles of assessment at UO—that it should be meaningful to academic units, align with their goals, and be faculty-driven. The goal of assessment at UO is to drive meaningful change rather than just collect data. Like most institutions, UO does not have universal participation in high-quality assessment. Nonetheless, the quality of work we see from units after the redesign of the process is promising and reinforces the approach.

1.C.6 - *Consistent with its mission, the institution establishes and assesses, across all associate and bachelor level programs or within a General Education curriculum, institutional learning outcomes and/or core competencies. Examples of such learning outcomes and competencies include, but are not limited to, effective communication skills, global awareness, cultural sensitivity, scientific and quantitative reasoning, critical analysis and logical thinking, problem solving, and/or information literacy.*

As a result of the institution's participation in a special project with NWCCU for its last seven-year report, the university began a process in 2017 to establish a set of institutional learning outcomes to be embedded in its required core education courses. The [University Senate approved](#) those outcomes, called [Methods of Inquiry](#), in March of 2018. The Methods of Inquiry, as stated in 1.A.1., derive from the university mission statement and focus on critical thinking, creative thinking, written communication, and ethical reasoning. Prior to this, the institution did not have assessable institutional learning outcomes. At the same time, the Core Education Council was established. Prior to this, there was no faculty committee focused on core education.

Around the same time, the [University Senate approved revisions](#) to its cultural competency requirement, establishing that students would take one course in United States: Difference, Inequality, and Agency and one course in Global Perspectives.

Upon approval of the new outcomes, the university outlined a plan to have all of its more than 800 core education courses submitted and reevaluated for alignment with the new learning outcomes by the end of summer 2021. That plan began in summer of 2019 where approximately 200 courses were reapproved. Due to the COVID-19 onset in the spring of 2020, the process was delayed for two years. The institution completed 95% of the reviews by the summer of 2023 and is now looking toward establishing ongoing assessment of those outcomes.

The [Core Education Council](#) is responsible for oversight of the assessment of institutional learning outcomes. The charge and responsibilities of the Core Education Council are as follows:

- Convene an ongoing campus dialogue on the purpose, value, assessment, evaluation, and improvement of the core education at the university.
- Establish, review, and revise the goals, objectives, and assessable learning outcomes of the core education.
- Establish, review, and revise policies and processes to ensure an effective, regular, and comprehensive system of assessment of student learning outcomes in core education.
- Review and recommend to the senate proposals and policies concerning core education requirements.
- Establish guidelines and criteria for courses that satisfy core education requirements. (However, the University Committee on Courses (UOCC) retains authority to operationalize criteria and guidelines and to approve courses.)
- Serve as a resource on core education for campus stakeholders including, but not limited to: the provost, the dean of undergraduate education, the UOCC, the Academic Council, the Undergraduate Council, the Academic Requirements Committee, the Scholastic Review Committee, and curriculum committees in schools and colleges.

- Interpret existing core education policy. Provide guidance on the interpretation of the goals and objectives of core education.
- Collaborate with the UO Teaching Academy on quality teaching and learning initiatives that are relevant to core education; identify topics for faculty scrutiny and insight through the Teaching Academy itself or its subgroups.
- Invite guests as appropriate for expertise.

In 2023-24, the Core Education Council produced a [report](#) that analyzed core education at UO and identified where it is falling short of its goals and promise. That report identified basic expectations for the student experience in core education courses by stating that core education should, at a minimum:

- Provide a compelling, cohesive experience to all students.
- Clearly communicate the purpose and value to students.
- Effectively articulate to students the key skills and outcomes (Methods of Inquiry) they should gain in those courses.

In addition, the report identified opportunities to leverage the core education student experience to address institutional priorities, stating that core education:

- Can be a central facilitator of student success by uniformly focusing on key academic and student success skills and habits.
- Can be a place to focus on career readiness attributes. The Methods of Inquiry are the foundation for that as they already map onto top employer-identified career readiness skills.
- Can be a place to ensure that students have opportunities to engage in high-impact practices (e.g., common intellectual experiences, collaborative assignments and projects, undergraduate research, writing-intensive courses, to name a few).

The analysis culminated in a recommendation to senior leadership, approved by the University Senate, to devote FTE to professional staff that can work with academic units and administration to:

- Create a more consistent and cohesive Core Education experience, focusing on evidence-based best practices.
- Improve the overall pedagogy and instruction in Core Education with a focus on student success.
- Ensure Core Education courses are explicitly focused on addressing the Methods of Inquiry in each course.
- Ensure students understand the how the Methods of Inquiry already map onto career readiness skills.
- Equip students with metacognitive and college success strategies.
- Revise and implement a plan to continually assess each Method of Inquiry, and to use those results to improve the Core Education experience.
- Engage in ongoing analysis of Core Education requirements and policies to improve timely graduation, including but not limited to investigating a revision to the BA/BS structure.
- Ensure that there is sufficient capacity in core education courses to meet student demand.

This recommendation matches a similar recommendation made through the UO Onward strategic planning process by the goal team focused on enhancing pathways to timely graduation. The recommendations are currently under consideration by senior leadership.

Despite limited resources devoted to Core Education assessment, the institution did engage with the [Composition Program](#) in 2021-22 on a project focused on the [assessment of written communication](#). In this project, the [Teaching Engagement Program](#) convened composition instructors in a [Community Accelerating the Impact of Teaching](#) (CAIT) to “examine and revise the course and program objectives for the writing sequence and articulate the essential and promising experimental teaching methods linked to these objectives.”

As part of this work, students were surveyed on writing [self-efficacy](#), what they found [valuable about their learning about writing](#), and their future goals for writing as they completed composition courses. The self-efficacy analysis revealed that students who had lower confidence about their time management skills and their ability to manage anxiety were more likely to receive C, D, and F grades. For the question about what students found valuable about their learning, it was found that the most common themes, skills, and comments reported by students could be easily mapped onto the updated learning outcomes. This project resulted in revised learning outcomes and a set of [teaching guides](#) that define key terms, highlight the rationale for each outcome, and provide samples of teaching activities that support student learning in relation to each outcome.

This example reflects the institution’s commitment to assessment work that draws from multiple sources, is faculty-led and informed, and results in useful and actionable outcomes.

1.C.7 - *The institution uses the results of its assessment efforts to inform academic and learning-support planning and practices to continuously improve student learning outcomes.*

As described in 1.C.5., the institution relies on the program assessment process to inform academic and learning-support planning and practices at the unit level. Examples of how academic units use assessment to inform local academic and learning-support are cited in 1.C.5. Other examples are briefly described on this [Closing the Loop](#) page. Each unit is required to fully document how they use assessment to close the loop through the annual assessment process described in 1.B.1 and 1.C.5.

Several other units are involved in routine assessment efforts to inform academic and learning-support planning and practices to improve student learning outcomes.

The institution has a robust teaching culture grounded in the strength of its [Teaching Engagement Program](#). TEP, led by the associate vice provost for teaching engagement, is housed in the Office of the Provost and very tightly integrated with curriculum development and review, faculty support, and assessment processes. At the UO, it is a core philosophy that one of the most important factors in student learning and achievement is what happens in its courses. TEP regularly engages with faculty to identify areas of institutional concern and collaborate on the improvement of practices. For instance, during the COVID-19 pandemic, a weekly online troubleshooting group of faculty and support professionals called [All Hands](#) was convened to rapidly surface and address issues. That group was so instrumental in helping the institution respond effectively to the pandemic that it continues to meet today.

Information from All Hands and other institutional and faculty-input sources inform TEP programming. For instance, the institution has created and made widely available a [Grade Equity dashboard](#). This dashboard provides disaggregated grade data for every course offered at UO over the past eleven years. In addition, it calculates an equity index for each course which is a measure of representational equity (percent of passing students from selected group divided by the percentage of all students from selected group) and shows the percentage point gap which is the difference between the percent of students receiving a D, F, N (No Pass), or W grade in a disaggregated group compared to a reference group. This dashboard is made available to all academic units and linked in their unit SharePoint folder referenced in 1.C.5. With this data, academic units and administrators can easily see where students overall are struggling to pass courses and where there are equity gaps in course completion.

As a result of data from this source, TEP convened a Community Accelerating the Impact of Teaching to focus on [high-challenge gateway courses](#) (defined as courses with a non-success rate greater than 20%). [CAITs](#) “bring faculty into small, compensated innovator groups to work on compelling problems and issues, which CAITs consider through lenses of both pedagogical and institutional change. CAIT fellows meet across multiple terms with facilitators from TEP, devoting time to community-building and activities such as reading research on student learning, revising courses, developing resources for colleagues, and recommending policy and curricular changes.” This CAIT [analyzed additional historical data and best practices and presented a set of recommendations](#) to the [Provost’s Teaching Academy](#), a provost-sponsored group of distinguished and actively engaged teaching faculty that meets quarterly to engage in community and learning.

A specific outcome of the aforementioned CAIT resulted from their finding that only 17% of students who failed a course in their first quarter graduated in four years. This finding led to a policy approved by the undergraduate council and the University Senate granting a measure of [first-term grade forgiveness](#) for undergraduate students. This policy automatically converts F grades to N grades in the first term, diminishing the impact of such grades on overall GPA. Since this policy began in 2020, over 3,000 first-term students have been positively impacted, primarily in large introductory and core education classes in math, business, writing, and economics.

TEP also hosts an annual [Summer Teaching Institute](#) which usually offers general session workshops for all faculty members, and stipended pathways for select faculty on timely topics generated by assessment efforts and faculty input. The theme for the 2024 institute is artificial intelligence and its impacts on teaching and learning.

The university’s [Tutoring and Academic Engagement Center](#) (TEAC) offers a variety of academic and learning support services in response to common issues identified in assessment efforts. [Class Encore](#) partners with faculty to offer peer-led study groups outside of class. Peer leaders are students who have succeeded in these courses. They attend the course with the students they are leading and participate in weekly planning sessions with faculty. Based on grade data and faculty assessments, Class Encore focuses on the institution’s most challenging courses, including accounting, biology, chemistry, physics, and mathematics. In 2023-24 Class Encore hosted 348 supplemental instruction study groups and had more than 2,500 student participants. In comparing disaggregated data by race/ethnicity and first-generation status, student participation in the program was representative of overall student populations (e.g., 22.5% Native American, Black, Latino/a/x, and Pacific Islander (NBLP) Class Encore participants vs. 18.6% NBLP UO students). Regular participants of Class Encore earn half of a final course grade higher than the class average and report that they are confident the program helped them pass the class.

TEAC offers other faculty- and student-identified areas of needed support such as [tutoring services](#) in mathematics, writing, the sciences, and languages, study skills [workshops](#), access to [learning specialists](#), [online learning resources](#) and an [online writing lab](#). Annually, assessment efforts focus on effective service delivery, program impact, and analysis of student need. Each year the center provides more than 23,000 academic support sessions and serves more than a third of first- and second-year students.

The [Peer Academic Coaching](#) program was started in 2021-22 in response to the identified lag in academic preparation and study skills for students coming out of high school post-COVID. Now in its third year, the program has increased the center’s capacity to provide individualized learning support and further clarified incoming students’ changing needs. 90% of participants reported that peer academic coaching was helpful to their learning and provided useful information, resources, and specific study strategies.

Collectively, these structures and processes bring together faculty, students, and administrative support to address well-documented challenges for students.

1.C.8 - *Transfer credit and credit for prior learning is accepted according to clearly defined, widely published, and easily accessible policies that provide adequate safeguards to ensure academic quality. In accepting transfer credit, the receiving institution ensures that such credit accepted is appropriate for its programs and comparable in nature, content, academic rigor, and quality.*

The UO accepts transfer credits from all degree-granting, regionally accredited institutions including those institutions that are recognized by the Ministry of Education within the county that the institution resides. Students can expect that all eligible transfer courses will earn credit if the courses are college-level. Courses may be deducted for repetition, regression, or general limitations as [outlined in the university catalog](#).

The university outlines its policies and process for transfer credit on the [university registrar website for transfer credit](#). These policies and practices are grounded in accreditation, state, and federal requirements, and include review by faculty in academic departments for direct articulation when that has not been determined by other processes (e.g., state of Oregon common course numbering system). UO offers credit for prior learning described as [alternative ways to earn credit](#) such as AP, IB, A-Level Exam, CLEP, and military credit.

The university provides two tools for students to help them determine how their courses will transfer. [Transferology](#), which focuses on courses at Oregon schools, and the [Transfer Equivalency Database \(TES®\)](#), which includes courses from institutions outside Oregon, both offer students a robust database to determine transferability. In addition, the registrar's website includes information about transfer programs defined by the state of Oregon (Oregon Transfer Module, Oregon Transfer Maps, Major Transfer Maps, and associate's degrees).

In 2020, the university implemented the TES® Public View to replace the homegrown transfer equivalency table. TES Public View allows students and partners to view the transfer equivalencies, in addition to the catalog descriptions of the courses from other institutions. This has allowed for improved communication between the registrar's office and departmental partners when requesting changes to transfer equivalencies. This tool has also allowed for greater transparency as the homegrown table did not publish all schools and courses. The TES platform publishes all the transfer equivalencies for domestic institutions and some institutions located in Canada.

The university will evaluate credit for prior learning (CPL) credit and an expansion of CLEP exams accepted in 2024-25. The faculty will consider approval to accept additional CLEP exams for transfer credit and broaden the institution's acceptance of credit for prior learning beyond IB, AP, CLEP, and JST. The university is also currently reviewing its policy regarding transfer credit from institutions that are not regionally accredited.

Degree Works is expected to go live in fall 2024, which will potentially change the institution's use of Transferology as Degree Works has its own platform. When implemented, the Transferology information site will be updated to reflect the new tool that is offered in Degree Works.

The institution also participates in state level efforts to support a seamless transfer for Oregon students. The [Oregon Transfer Maps \(Core\)](#) ensure that students that complete a core transfer map of thirty credits at another Oregon institution can transfer that block of courses into UO and have them count toward the university's core bachelor's degree requirements. [Major Transfer Maps](#) are statewide agreements for specific majors that ensure seamless transfer between institutions.

1.C.9 - *The institution's graduate programs are consistent with its mission, are in keeping with the expectations of its respective disciplines and professions, and are described through nomenclature that is appropriate to the levels of graduate and professional degrees offered. The graduate programs differ from undergraduate programs by requiring, among other things, greater depth of study; demands on student intellectual or creative capacities; knowledge of the literature of the field; and ongoing student engagement in research, scholarship, creative expression, and/or relevant professional practice.*

Consistent with its mission and with its membership in the AAU the [graduate programs](#) at the UO are designed to provide students with a rigorous education that prepares them for careers in a variety of fields. The curricula are designed to be challenging and to promote critical thinking, analytical skills, and problem-solving abilities.

The UO's graduate programs emphasize research and scholarship, and many programs require students to conduct original research in their field of study. This focus on research helps to advance knowledge in a variety of fields and prepares students for careers in academia, industry, and government.

In keeping with the expectations of its respective disciplines and professions, the curriculum of each graduate program is developed in consultation with experts in the field, including UO faculty, through the relevant departments and through university faculty curriculum committees, external peer reviewers, and industry professionals as described in 1.C.1. and 1.C.2. Each new graduate program is subject to an external review panel consisting of at least three faculty members from other universities in the relevant field of study. This ensures that the curriculum is up-to-date, relevant, and reflects the latest research and best practices in the field.

In addition, the university relies on professional accreditation to ensure its programs meet disciplinary expectations. Individual programs in the university's professional schools and colleges are accredited by the following organizations:

- Accrediting Council on Education in Journalism and Mass Communications
- Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business
- American Alliance of Museums
- American Bar Association
- American Chemical Society
- American Psychological Association
- American Speech-Language-Hearing Association
- Commission on Accreditation for Marriage and Family Therapy Education
- Commission on English Language Program Accreditation
- Council for Interior Design Accreditation
- Landscape Architecture Accreditation Board
- National Architectural Accrediting Board
- National Association of Schools of Art and Design
- National Association of Schools of Music
- National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration
- Network of Schools of Public Policy, Affairs, and Administration
- Planning Accreditation Board

The UO offers several levels of graduate and professional programs that are categorized appropriately to the levels of graduate and professional degrees. The [Division of Graduate Studies](#) describes its programs as follows:

[Master's Degree:](#) A master's degree is typically a one- to three-year program that requires the completion

of coursework and often a thesis or capstone project. At the UO, most master's degrees are designated as Master of Arts (MA) or Master of Science (MS) degrees. Other master's degrees available at the UO include:

- Master of Architecture (MArch)
- Master of Interior Architecture (MIArch)
- Master of Landscape Architecture (MLA)
- Master of Accounting (MActg)
- Master of Business Administration (MBA)
- Master of Community & Regional Planning (MCRP)
- Master of Public Administration (MPA)
- Master of Nonprofit Management (MNM)
- Master of Education (MEd)
- Master of Laws (LLM)
- Master of Music (MMus)
- Master of Fine Arts (MFA)

Education Specialists Degree: Newly approved at the university in 2023-24, Education Specialist degrees are professional degrees that sit between a master's degree and a doctoral degree, and that often lead to licensure in its respective professions. The UO approved its first EdS degree in 2023-24 in Educational Leadership. That degree is designed to serve educational leaders who play roles in schools that do not require a doctoral degree. It is also required in many states for those aspiring to be school superintendents. The university is currently considering an EdS in School Psychology.

Doctoral Degree: A doctoral degree typically requires several years of study beyond the master's level. At the UO, doctoral degrees include:

- Doctor of Philosophy (PhD)
- Doctor of Education (DEd)
- Doctor of Musical Arts (DMA)
- Doctor of Jurisprudence (JD)

Graduate Certificate: A graduate certificate is a shorter program of study that typically focuses on a specific topic or skillset. At the UO, graduate certificates are awarded in a variety of fields, and are available as either add-ons to a degree program or as stand-alone credentials, depending on the program.

Graduate Specialization: A graduate specialization is either a subdivision of a major or an interdisciplinary track in which a strong graduate-level curriculum is available. These are only available as add-ons to degree programs and may not be pursued as stand-alone credentials.

Graduate Microcredential: New to the UO as of fall 2023, a graduate microcredential is a stand-alone credential consisting of at least three graduate courses designed to engage learners in specific, advanced, high-quality graduate training that does not require the time and financial commitment of a degree or certificate.

The UO has a long-standing tradition of providing exceptional graduate education across a wide range of

disciplines, from the humanities and social sciences to the natural sciences and professional fields. The graduate programs offered by the university differ significantly from the undergraduate programs, requiring greater depth of study, higher demands on intellectual and creative capacities, a broader knowledge of the literature of the field, and ongoing student engagement in research, scholarship, creative expression, and/or relevant professional practice.

One way the university ensures that its graduate programs are more rigorous than its undergraduate programs is through its [admissions process](#). The admissions standards for graduate programs are much higher than those for undergraduate programs, with applicants expected to have a strong academic background, relevant work or research experience, and a clear understanding of their research or professional goals. Additionally, graduate students are often required to provide writing samples, letters of recommendation, and personal statements that demonstrate their ability to engage in advanced scholarship or professional practice.

Once accepted into a graduate program, students are expected to engage in a much deeper level of study than they did as undergraduates. The university policy on [credit and student time commitment](#) stipulates that graduate students should expect to spend 160 hours per term on average in a four-credit graduate course as opposed to 120 hours per term for a four-credit undergraduate course. This policy sets expectations for students and for faculty in the course approval process. Graduate courses are typically more focused and demanding, with students expected to engage in critical analysis, original research, and creative expression at a much higher level than they did in their undergraduate courses. Students are also typically expected to be much more self-directed and independent in their studies, with less guidance and structure provided by their professors.

Many graduate students are expected to engage in ongoing research or creative projects throughout their studies, often working closely with faculty members or outside professionals in their field. This engagement may take the form of individual research projects, collaborative research with other students or faculty members, or participation in ongoing research initiatives or professional practice.

To support graduate students in their research and scholarship, the university provides a wide range of resources, including state-of-the-art research facilities, access to cutting-edge technology, and funding opportunities for research and travel. Graduate students are also encouraged to participate in professional conferences and other events that allow them to share their research with others in their field and to gain valuable feedback and insights from colleagues.

Overall, the UO is committed to providing graduate students with an educational experience that is rigorous, challenging, and rewarding. By demanding greater depth of study, intellectual and creative capacities, and ongoing engagement in research, scholarship, and professional practice, the university prepares its graduates to be leaders in their fields and to make a positive impact on the world around them.

Student Achievement

1.D.1 - *Consistent with its mission, the institution recruits and admits students with the potential to benefit from its educational programs. It orients students to ensure they understand the requirements related to their programs of study and receive timely, useful, and accurate information and advice about relevant academic requirements, including graduation and transfer policies.*

Recruitment

The UO [Office of Admissions](#) recruits and admits prospective undergraduate students who fall under one of three residency categories: Oregon resident, not a resident of Oregon, and living in the United States, international.

For recruitment purposes, admissions counselors disseminate information to prospective students through a variety of programs, such as high school and community college presentations, college fairs, UO receptions and off-campus events, consortium travel with other colleges and universities, virtual and in-person meetings, on-campus events and presentations. Admissions employs a team of regional admissions counselors to provide in-depth recruitment in key markets (Portland, California, Illinois, Colorado, Arizona, Texas). In the coming year, regional recruitment will begin in the greater Seattle area as well. There is also a team of counselors on campus in Eugene that travels to areas where regional recruiters do not live.

Regarding the process of admitting students, admissions has implemented many changes since 2017. In 2018, the university signed on with the Common Application, which improved access for students applying to the UO. Due to the ease in applying, in the last five years, the number of applications submitted has increased by 94%. The Coalition Application was adopted in 2019. Due to low performance, membership with that application concluded in 2023.

In 2020, the office implemented Slate, an application management system that improved the processing of applications, communication with students and their families, and timely decisions. At the same time, admissions implemented the Self-Reported Academic Record, through which students self-report their classes and grades instead of submitting a transcript. This was adopted at the same time as a test-optional policy, meaning students could apply for admission without an SAT or ACT score. The application completion rate improved from 85% to 90% after these changes were implemented, thus improving access to admission at UO.

To determine preparation for UO academics, undergraduate admission requirements are similar to those in 2017 and can be found on the admissions website:

- [Freshmen Admission Requirements](#)
- [Transfer Admission Requirements](#)
- [International Admission Requirements](#)

There is one change to mathematics requirements for first-year admission since 2017. Due to an initiative in the state of Oregon, led by the Oregon Department of Education and the Higher Education Coordinating Commission, all Oregon public universities have agreed to amend mathematics requirements for admission. Through fall 2023 admission, students were required to complete mathematics coursework through Algebra II. After fall 2023, students may qualify for admission with any third year of mathematics that has a primary focus on concepts in algebra, calculus, data science, discrete mathematics, geometry, mathematical analysis, probability, or statistics. This change was approved by both the mathematics department and the interim provost before being adopted by the university.

Orientation

Once a student accepts admission to the UO, they are engaged in an introduction and orientation to the university. From 2017-19, Student Orientation Programs provided a required, comprehensive, completely in-person [IntroDUCKtion](#) (orientation) experience for all new undergraduate first-year, transfer, and international students in the weeks and months prior to fall classes, and during each mid-year admission cycle. IntroDUCKtion sessions included a full two-day experience with educational sessions lead by academic advisors focused on Core Education and degree completion requirements, plus Faculty Perspectives, led by teaching faculty from across the institution who spoke to the classroom environment, undergraduate research opportunities, their own research and teaching, and the breadth and depth of academic pursuits at the UO. In this period students were provided an advising workbook, which mapped the Core Education requirements and provided students with a road map of where to begin (based on placement scores, transferrable credits, and advanced credits from AP and IB programs). The capstone to

this experience was a 1:1 or small group advising appointment from their academic major advising team to review their earned credits, test scores, and academic history, and determine a set of courses for their first term.

After delivering primarily online orientation during the COVID-19 pandemic, beginning with the fall 2021 cohort through the present day, the orientation process includes a hybrid experience for all new students. Students attend an in-person orientation program—that includes in-person presentations of Introduction to Academics and Faculty Perspectives—plus virtual advising appointments and registration, and Core Education curriculum via a community site on Canvas, the university’s learning management system. For all students, the advising appointments are where relevant academic requirements, including graduation and transfer policies, are discussed. International students are also required to attend [International Student Orientation](#) hosted by the Division of Global Engagement.

1.D.2 - *Consistent with its mission and in the context of and in comparison with regional and national peer institutions, the institution establishes and shares widely a set of indicators for student achievement including, but not limited to, persistence, completion, retention, and postgraduation success. Such indicators of student achievement should be disaggregated by race, ethnicity, age, gender, socioeconomic status, first-generation college student, and any other institutionally meaningful categories that may help promote student achievement and close barriers to academic excellence and success (equity gaps).*

As described in 1.B.1., the university has long monitored and shared disaggregated indicators of student achievement on its [Institutional Research website](#). This includes retention, completion, and postgraduate success data for FTFT (first-time, full-time) and transfer undergraduate students at both the [university level](#) and [school/college level](#).

To provide a more complete picture of student achievement for UO students, the institution shares data from the [Student Achievement Measure \(SAM\)](#) initiative. Because these data include outcomes for students who were at UO but transferred and/or completed at another institution, it is a more accurate depiction of completion data. In addition, this measure tracks outcomes for transfer students in the same way.

As described in 1.B.2, the institution monitors and makes available [peer comparator data](#) for retention rates, four- and six-year graduation rates, actual vs. predicted six-year graduation rates based on the [U.S. News and World Report formula](#), and predicted vs. actual retention rates based on high school GPA. These data sets are used to compare UO student outcomes with national and regional peers to inform institutional decision-making, especially with regard to student success initiatives and resource allocation.

In addition, the Office of the Provost hosts an interactive [Undergraduate Student Dashboard](#) that allows a deeper dive into undergraduate retention and graduation rates down to the school/college, department, and major levels, and allows sorting and comparisons by several demographic factors such as first-generation, Pell eligibility, gender, and race/ethnicity. This dashboard is intended to inform school/college and department decision-making on student achievement efforts, especially closing equity gaps where they exist.

Post-graduation data include [post-baccalaureate education data](#), which shows the percent of graduates who pursued additional education one year, two years, and five years out from graduation and the areas of study they pursued. There are also data on [post-graduate student outcomes](#) showing where students end up, average and median salaries by school and college, employers and industries, and a measure of the relationship between career readiness activities while in school and employment outcomes. The last measure demonstrates a significant association with participation in career readiness activities while in school (e.g., internships, research, student organization leadership, practica) and employment or continued education six months out from graduation. The Office of Institutional Research is currently working on approaches to disaggregate the postgraduation data by student demographics.

In 2022, the university contracted with Lightcast to provide alumni data over a longer time horizon. Lightcast pairs institutional alumni data with its own data sources to provide a matched set of alumni data on career outcomes. In 2024, the university contracted for the updated alumni product that provides access to a database of matched alumni going back decades, which is sortable on a variety of factors. These data will allow the institution a broader and longer-term picture of post-graduate outcomes and will provide academic units access to the same kind of data down to the academic major level.

The institutional research website was updated in June 2024 to be more user-friendly and to better support data-informed decision-making. This redesign provides more organized access to data sets related to student demographics and outcomes.

1.D.3 - *The institution's disaggregated indicators of student achievement should be widely published and available on the institution's website. Such disaggregated indicators should be aligned with meaningful, institutionally identified indicators benchmarked against indicators for peer institutions at the regional and national levels and be used for continuous improvement to inform planning, decision-making, and allocation of resources.*

As described in 1.D.2., disaggregated indicators of student achievement are published on the [Institutional Research website](#) which are benchmarked against peers as described in 1.B.2.

As described in 1.B.1, the UO Onward strategic planning process has produced institutional-level goals and KPIs of student achievement. Phase three of UO Onward will focus on aligning unit-level indicators of success, programs, resource allocation, and general efforts across campus toward the achievement of the institutional goals and KPIs.

The institution monitors and makes available [peer comparator data](#) for retention rates, four- and six-year graduation rates, actual vs. predicted six-year graduation rates based on the [U.S. News and World Report formula](#), and predicted vs. actual retention rates based on high school GPA. These data sets are used to compare UO student outcomes with national and regional peers to inform institutional decision-making, especially concerning indicators of effectiveness for student achievement and resource allocation.

That data shows that our retention of students to the second year (87.2% for fall 2020 cohort) has remained relatively steady over the past ten years (except for the COVID dip) and is comparable to the national peers most like UO in terms of enrolled students (Colorado and Iowa). Compared to other national peers, the institution's retention rate lags behind those with more selective admissions (Michigan, Virginia, Washington). Compared to [regional peers](#), UO is in the upper half of institutions.

The data on four-year graduation rates demonstrates a steady climb beginning with the fall 2012 cohort at 52.9% through the fall 2016 cohort at 61.3%, an 8.4% increase. There was a downward trend of 4.2% from the fall 2016 to the fall 2019 cohort, which is at 57.1%. Overall, there was a 4.2% increase in four-year graduation rates from the fall 2012 cohort to the fall 2019 cohort. Like the retention data, UO is comparable to peer institutions with similar student profiles (Colorado and Iowa), and lags those with more selective admissions. UO performs slightly better than regional peers with a four-year graduation rate fourth from the top in comparison. The trends and comparison for six-year graduation rates are very similar. UO has maintained a 71-74% six-year graduation rate over the last six cohorts and the relative position with peers is roughly the same as for four-year graduation rates.

Because graduation and retention rates by themselves do not tell the whole story, the university considers data that attempt to account for other factors in terms of the students it admits. The U.S. News and World Report model for calculating actual vs. predicted six-year graduation rates attempts to account for variables such as test scores, percentage of students receiving financial aid, and percentage of students placing in the top 10% of their high school classes. Using this formula, UO consistently has a six-year graduation rate three to four percentage points (pp) higher than predicted by the model. In comparison to national and

regional peers, UO is in the top half of both groups in terms of the difference between actual and predicted graduation rates. It should be noted that there are some documented flaws with the model so the institution calibrates its reliance on these data accordingly. In addition, UO became test-optional after 2020 which will make this kind of modeling even more difficult.

The data on graduation and retention rates also demonstrates persistent student achievement equity gaps. For retention to the second year, there has been a persistent difference between under-represented ethnicities and all students of ~5-6 pp over the past ten years. For four-year graduation rates, the difference has been ~5-10 pp, and for six-year graduation rates it has been ~4-9 pp.

Both the recent dips in overall four-year graduation rates and the persistent student achievement equity gaps are key data points informing the UO Onward strategic planning process. When the institution began work to improve retention and graduation rates beginning in 2015, the strategies and indicators were focused on overall rates. While improvements were made overall, it is now apparent that a concerted focus on closing equity gaps is needed. This priority is a central component of the current strategic direction and KPIs.

1.D.4 - *The institution's processes and methodologies for collecting and analyzing indicators of student achievement are transparent and are used to inform and implement strategies and allocate resources to mitigate perceived gaps in achievement and equity.*

As described in 1.C.5, each academic department is provided access to a SharePoint folder that contains three to four folders:

- Annual Program Assessment – contains all annual assessment documents.
- Data – contains a variety of data sources including graduate and undergraduate student department profiles, alumni data from Lightcast, and dashboards for grade equity (DFW rates disaggregated), course materials costs, student experience surveys, operational metrics, and disaggregated undergraduate student achievement data.
- Decennial Program Review – contains historical documents for decennial program review.
- Specialized Accreditation – contains specialized accreditation reports where applicable.

These folders are available to anyone in the department and help departments to improve their assessment work with access to higher quality, continuously updated data. The folders also provide an ongoing record of program assessment to provide departmental continuity in these efforts as leadership and faculty come and go. A few items from those folders are highlighted here to demonstrate transparent processes for sharing data related to indicators of student achievement that inform strategies to mitigate gaps in achievement and equity.

First, department profiles ([Computer Science example](#)) provide a five-year view of disaggregated undergraduate student demographic data and overall measures of student achievement in the major such as retention, graduation rates, and time to degree. A more detailed department profile ([Computer Science example](#)) provides retention and course grade outcomes disaggregated by underrepresented minority, gender, Pell eligibility, and first-generation status. These snapshots are meant to inform program assessment and should generate additional lines of inquiry for deeper analysis.

Second, each department's Grade Equity Dashboard is linked to from the folder. This dashboard, as discussed in previous sections, provides disaggregated grade data for every course taught by the department. These data drive departmental efforts to address course and program equity gaps.

Third, each folder links to the department's [Student Experience Survey](#) summary dashboard. Since 2017, the Office of the Provost has been working with the University Senate to [revise UO's teaching evaluation system](#).

As part of that work, the instrument for gathering student feedback was revised to remove the old student ratings system, which is known to incorporate biases, particularly for women faculty and faculty of color. The new system uses the Student Experience Survey, which asks students to reflect on their experiences related to the university's [four teaching standards](#): professional, engaged, inclusive, and research-led. The summary for each department provides an overview of reported student experiences in their courses to inform unit-level changes to curricula and teaching practices, with a particular focus on inclusive teaching.

Fourth, each department folder provides a link to the institution's [Course Materials Affordability](#) dashboard. The university identified course materials costs as a key equity issue and developed a [strategic plan](#) to address course materials costs. The dashboard allows units to analyze data on course materials costs for their courses to inform curriculum planning. In response to state legislation and the strategic plan, the institution has allocated resources to encourage the adoption of open educational resources (OERs), identify low-cost courses (defined as less than \$50) in the course schedule, and report course materials costs in the course schedule at the time of registration. Students can [search for low- and no-cost courses](#) in the class schedule.

As an example of bringing these data to bear on unit decision-making and resource allocation, especially with regard to mitigating equity gaps, the Office of the Provost implemented a new requirement in 2022-23. Beginning in 2022-23, each academic unit was required to identify a Student Achievement Goal, with particular emphasis on closing equity gaps where they exist. SAGs are now incorporated into department [annual program assessment](#) processes as described in the [undergraduate assessment guidelines](#).

To launch this effort, the Office of the Provost hosted a [Closing Student Achievement Equity Gaps Summit](#) in the spring of 2023. Department heads and deans were invited to review institutional and unit data, hear about best practices, learn about available institutional support, identify common themes across units, and develop next steps. A summary of [each unit's student achievement goals](#) was shared with participants after the summit. Units set goals to:

- Decrease percentage of DFNW rates in key courses and close equity gaps in those rates.
- Increase participation in internships and other experiential learning opportunities for students from underrepresented groups.
- Close retention rate gap between Pell-eligible and non-Pell-eligible students.
- Increase retention and graduation rates for underrepresented students.
- Increase the number of underrepresented students in the major.
- Increase the percentage of undergraduate courses with low- or no-cost textbooks to 70%.

The next phase of this work is for units to dig further into the data related to their goals, develop strategies for achieving the goals, and determine appropriate resource allocation for strategies.

[Undergraduate Education and Student Success' Summer Bridge](#) program launched in 2021 in response to data on early college success for first-generation, low-income, and historically underrepresented students to help close student achievement equity gaps for those students. Between 2021 and 2023, 1,226 first-year students were served with promising early outcomes for participants vs. non-participants. Participants had higher retention rates, cumulative GPAs, and average credits completed than non-participants.

UESS also manages UO's [First Year Programs](#), which include [Freshmen Interest Groups \(FIGs\)](#), [First-Year and Transfer Seminars](#), and [Academic Residential Communities \(ARCs\)](#). These programs are a response to the well-documented research that engaging first-year students in small-group academic communities is a high-impact practice that results in improved student achievement outcomes. UESS conducts regular assessments of these programs to inform the refinement of strategies and determine where to allocate resources.

Finally, in 2021 UESS [conducted a study](#) to evaluate the efficacy of leveraging predictive analytic data to implement a targeted advising intervention. The study used a randomized experimental design in which students identified as being unlikely to return for their second term were assigned to either a treatment or control group. The treatment group received targeted advising. Early results were promising—students who received the advising were more likely to enroll in the second term, earned higher first-term GPAs, and sustained good academic standing. Retention to the second term for the treatment group was roughly equivalent to that of students identified as having the lowest risk of attrition, suggesting the intervention promotes equity. A set of recommendations was made at the conclusion of the study, with more work in this area being planned.

Each of these examples demonstrates the university's commitment to transparency in sharing data that is useful for units in planning and resource allocation.

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON

Addendum to Year 7 EIE Report Response to Year 6 PRFR Evaluation Committee Findings

Standard 2.A.1

The institution demonstrates an effective governance structure, with a board(s) or other governing body(ies) composed predominantly of members with no contractual, employment relationship, or personal financial interest with the institution. Such members shall also possess clearly defined authority, roles, and responsibilities. Institutions that are part of a complex system with multiple boards, a centralized board, or related entities shall have, with respect to such boards, written and clearly defined contractual authority, roles, and responsibilities for all entities. In addition, authority and responsibility between the system and the institution is clearly delineated in a written contract, described on its website and in its public documents, and provides the NWCCU accredited institution with sufficient autonomy to fulfill its mission.

Committee Finding and Rationale

- Board's calendar for reviewing institutional and board policies and procedures _N_

The institution's Board of Trustees was established in 2014 after a change in state law allowed institutions to create their own boards. Governance policies, constitution, bylaws, and institutional policies and procedures are provided and appear adequate to this standard. They define authorities, roles, and responsibilities. Documents refer to changes in state law granting independence of their board, but no link to that law is provided. The review panel did not find the board's calendar for reviewing institutional and board policies and procedures, but we did find some policies dated more than thirteen years ago, so the board's calendar for reviewing policies and procedures should be provided clearly in the Year 7 report.

Response to Committee Findings

The Board of Trustees regularly reviews governing documents. Following the conclusion of the academic year board staff, trustees, and key administrators review relevant governing documents. If necessary, updates are proposed to the board during its September and December meetings. The management of university policies has been delegated to the university administration. Policies are managed by a policy advisory council, which meets monthly during the academic year to review existing amendments to existing policies and to approve any new policy proposals. Parties designated as "policy holders" for each university policy are expected to review policies on a ten-year cycle and make any recommendations for changes to the Policy Advisory Council, which then forwards any recommendations to the president for approval.

Standard 2.B.1

Within the context of its mission and values, the institution adheres to the principles of academic freedom and independence that protect its constituencies from inappropriate internal and external influences, pressures, and harassment.

Committee Finding and Rationale

- Evidence that the students also have academic freedom _N_

The institution provided its Academic Freedom policy for faculty; Article 5 from its collective bargaining agreement for faculty which details academic freedom, free speech, and responsibilities of faculty; and a 2021 statement from academic leadership reiterating the importance of academic freedom for faculty. The institution also provided its 2010 Freedom of Inquiry and Free Speech policy which applies to faculty, staff, students, and visitors.

The academic freedom policies and statements are more recent than the 2010 policy, and the academic freedom policies explicitly apply to faculty, but their application to students is unclear.

Response to Committee Findings

The Office of the Provost's policies work group has been working to consolidate and revise the UO's academic freedom, freedom of speech, and freedom of inquiry policies. This work group has solicited feedback from numerous offices (e.g., Ombuds Program, Office of Investigations and Civil Rights Compliance), advisory groups, and relevant individuals (e.g., deans and associate deans, unit heads, faculty). This policy was approved by the University Senate on March 13, 2024, the Policy Advisory Council (PAC) on April 23, 2024, the President Scholz on May 14, 2024, and is publicly available in the UO Policy Library - [Policy Number II.05.01 Academic Freedom, Freedom of Inquiry, and Free Speech](#).

Standard 2.C.4

The institution's policies and procedures regarding the secure retention of student records must include provisions related to confidentiality, release, and the reliable backup and retrievability of such records.

Committee Finding and Rationale

- Policies/procedures regarding secure retention of student records, (i.e., back-up, confidentiality, release, protection from cybersecurity issues or other emergencies) _Y_

The institution provided its records retention schedule, policy on student records, and privacy policy. While the policy on student records addressed custody of records, secure locations for them, FERPA training for employees, and access rights for students; it did not address how the records are protected from cybersecurity issues or emergencies. The institution did not address those two contingencies in the narrative for its Year 6 report either.

Response to Committee Findings

The UO follows the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) cybersecurity framework to define the safeguards and controls applicable to university business operations. The information security program initiatives are applied across the university to help support the information security and regulatory compliance needs of areas that manage student records and other services focused on students and their information. Additional information can be found on the Information Security Office website: <https://infosec.uoregon.edu/policies-procedures-and-standards>

For additional questions or information, please contact the UO's chief information security officer at ciso@uoregon.edu.

Standard 2.E.1

The institution utilizes relevant audit processes and regular reporting to demonstrate financial stability, including sufficient cash flow and reserves to achieve and fulfill its mission.

Committee Finding and Rationale

- Latest external financial audit including management letter _N_
- Endowment and giving reports _N_

The institution provides quarterly financial reports and annual financial audits to its board. These reports are available on the board's meeting and agendas web page. The institution provided its policies related to fiscal operations, finance, and internal controls as well as statements and reports for cash flow, audits, fees and revenues, grants and contracts, and investment revenue. The annual audit report appeared to be an internal one, and no external financial audit with management letter was found. The panel also did not find reports about endowment and giving. Because these reports (external audit, endowment, and giving) were omitted, the institution should be sure to include them in its Year 7 report.

Response to Committee Findings

- Latest external financial audit including management letter
 - [KBW] FY23 Audited statements: https://pages.uoregon.edu/baoforms/bao_drupal_6/sites/ba.uoregon.edu/files/fy2023UOafs.pdf. No additional management letter was issued/received.
 - [KBW] Current and prior-year audited statements are available on the Transparency web page <https://www.uoregon.edu/accountability/transparency>.
- Endowment and giving report: [Endowment and Giving report.pdf](#)

Standard 2.F.1

Faculty, staff, and administrators are apprised of their conditions of employment, work assignments, rights and responsibilities, and criteria and procedures for evaluation, retention, promotion, and termination.

Committee Finding and Rationale

- Policies/procedures for apprising employees of working conditions, rights and responsibilities, evaluation, retention, promotion, and termination _N_

While the institution provided relevant policies, it appears that most of the conditions, criteria, and procedures for employees other than faculty are managed through agreements with represented employee groups. The institution provided letters of agreement and collective bargaining agreements. The institution did not, however, indicate clearly how employees are apprised of conditions, criteria, and procedures. How it conveys this information to employees should be clearly explained in the Year 7 report.

Response to Committee Findings

Employees are apprised of their conditions of employment, work assignments, rights and responsibilities, and criteria and process for evaluation, retention, promotion, and termination in a variety of ways.

Much of this information is available online on UO's website, primarily [University HR's Employee & Labor Relations website](#), the [Office of Investigations and Civil Rights Compliance website](#), the [UO Policy Library](#), and the [Office of the Provost website](#).

Prior to hire, future employees have access to the position posting, which gives a high-level summary of the

work assignments for that particular position; upon receiving an offer, candidates typically receive a verbal offer from a supervisor, which is followed up with a written offer letter. This letter provides additional information about working conditions, rights and responsibilities, and conditions of employment.

Upon hire, new faculty and staff participate in a new employee or new faculty orientation program where they are verbally apprised of information related to many topics including working conditions and rights and responsibilities, and given written materials as follow up. New faculty are invited to participate in a number of [programs](#) in their first three years at UO to assist them in continuing to understand their work assignment, rights and responsibilities, criteria and process for evaluation and promotion. These programs are designed with community building in mind and are a part of our active retention efforts. Asynchronous modules in the New Faculty Success community site on Canvas outline expectations related to teaching excellence, mentorship, and promotion, in addition to support available for their research/scholarship.

Employees can review their position description, which describes work assignments, at any time on the [HR website](#). Direct supervisors are responsible for talking with employees about their work assignments, performance, and professional development and promotion opportunities on an ongoing basis.

In addition, emails are regularly sent to all employees from HR providing [information about working conditions and expectations](#), such as the Drug-free Workplace policy and the Respectful Workplace policy. UO also requires all employees to complete [training](#) regarding Workplace Harassment and Discrimination and Understanding Sexual Misconduct, Resources, and Employee Responsibilities.

UO conducted an all-employee workplace climate survey in 2022 and plans are underway to administer another survey in the next academic year. The results of the 2022 survey were shared with employees, and supervisors had group and/or individual discussions with employees about the results and actions the unit would take to improve the workplace climate. UO also maintains employee engagement-related resources and training opportunities for both [managers](#) and [employees](#) to help with retention and workplace climate-related matters. The Office of the Provost hosts [New Unit Head Onboarding](#), and a monthly leadership development series for new department heads, new associate deans, etc., and [Q&A sessions](#) are available throughout the academic year for faculty and unit heads to be prepared for third year reviews, promotion, tenure, sabbatical, and other employment related milestones. Training opportunities are communicated via direct email outreach, through the Faculty Success newsletter, and via the Workplace newsletter.

Standard 2.F.3

Consistent with its mission, programs, and services, the institution employs faculty, staff, and administrators sufficient in role, number, and qualifications to achieve its organizational responsibilities, educational objectives, establish and oversee academic policies, and ensure the integrity and continuity of its academic programs.

Committee Finding and Rationale

- Administrator/staff /faculty evaluation policies/procedures_N_

The institution provided information about recruitment and hiring of faculty and staff as well as an academic org chart. However, the panel did not find any assessment of sufficiency—e.g., faculty-to-student ratios. The Institutional Hiring Plan pertains to tenure-track faculty and appeared to be funded through the Academic Allocation Model to identify and hire tenure-track faculty according to the strategic needs of the institution. The panel infers an assessment of sufficiency informs this model, but this is an inference.

Similar strategic hiring processes for administrators and/or staff was not found. This report would be stronger if it had addressed explicitly how the institution assesses sufficiency of faculty, administrators, and staff.

Response to Committee Findings

The UO manages the employment of faculty, staff, and administrators in several ways. The Institutional Hiring Plan is a robust process for allocating positions for new and replacement tenure-track faculty across the institution. As examples, in areas where we have rapid growth, such as psychology, physiology, business school, we use the IHP toward hiring in those areas. For other employee categories, including non-tenure-track faculty, the university's budget model is one in which the president and provost allocate funds to schools and colleges and administrative units. These units are then expected to manage their budgets and make decisions related to needed non-tenure track faculty, staff, and administrator hiring to meet their necessary functions. The Office of the Provost utilizes a data report known as Operational Metrics, which is produced annually in full, and a truncated version during fall quarterly, which provide course size distribution, credit hours (a proxy for students) to tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty ratios among others to inform management across years and within. The full Operational Metrics are among the primary data source used in determining the allocation of tenure lines through the Institutional Hiring Plan and the hiring of non-tenure-track faculty. Likewise, historically, budget reductions rely on unit leadership to make strategic decisions on where reductions should occur while maintaining necessary functions.

The university also provides for a centralized strategic investment process that allows departments to make requests for additional funding, including staffing, to meet strategic needs. These requests are reviewed by an advisory group that includes faculty, students, and staff. The advisory group makes investment recommendations to the president who makes final investment decisions. A large portion of these investments are typically focused on additional staffing needs. This model allows a university-wide evaluation and consideration of which investments should be prioritized.

University leadership also regularly reviews data related to the number of individuals employed in faculty, staff, and administrator roles compared to student enrollment. Teaching [faculty-to-student ratios](https://ir.uoregon.edu/uo-overview/ratios) are published on the institutional research website (<https://ir.uoregon.edu/uo-overview/ratios>). The ratio has remained fairly steady over the past decade at about 18:1. Leadership also reviews teaching faculty to student ratio comparisons with relevant comparator institutions (published here <https://ir.uoregon.edu/uo-overview/peer-institutions>). The UO is in line with both national and regional peers, which range from 15:1 to 21:1. The president, provost, and senior vice president of finance and administration have regular meetings with the vice presidents and deans that allow for ongoing monitoring of staffing and budgetary needs and overall execution of school and college and department functions. This allows university leaders to work together on budget decisions to address concerns that could arise in execution of necessary functions based on staffing ratios and needs. For example, we've shifted administrative support to emphasize shared services based on business and operational demands and financial capacity.

Standard 2.G.2

The institution publishes in a catalog, or provides in a manner available to students and other stakeholders, current and accurate information that includes: institutional mission; admission requirements and procedures; grading policy; information on academic programs and courses, including degree and program completion requirements, expected learning outcomes, required course sequences, and projected timelines to completion based on normal student progress and the frequency of course offerings;

names, titles, degrees held, and conferring institutions for administrators and full-time faculty; rules and regulations for conduct, rights, and responsibilities; tuition, fees, and other program costs; refund policies and procedures for students who withdraw from enrollment; opportunities and requirements for financial aid; and the academic calendar.

Rationale

The institution provided a link to its online catalog as well as print version. Additional links for other information were included in the report and can be reached through the online catalog with some effort. The panel, however, did not find the institution's information about the names, titles, and degrees held and conferring institutions for administrators and faculty.

Committee Finding and Rationale

- Names, titles, degrees held, and conferring institutions for administrators and full-time faculty _N_

The institution provided a link to its online catalog as well as print version. Additional links for other information were included in the report and can be reached through the online catalog with some effort. The panel, however, did not find the institution's information about the names, titles, and degrees held and conferring institutions for administrators and faculty.

Response to Committee Findings

In the [UO Catalog](#) every school/college page links to departments that include a faculty tab. For example, under [College or Arts and Sciences, Humanities Section](#), there are links to each department in the division. The department links have faculty tabs (e.g., [Cinema Studies Faculty](#)) that include names, titles, and degrees held and conferring institutions.

The university administration list is included in the [About the University of Oregon – University Leadership](#) page of the catalog and is linked here for reference.

Standard 2.G.6

The institution designs, maintains, and evaluates a systematic and effective program of academic advisement to support student development and success. Personnel responsible for advising students are knowledgeable of the curriculum, program and graduation requirements, and are adequately prepared to successfully fulfill their responsibilities. Advising requirements and responsibilities of advisors are defined, published, and made available to students.

Committee Finding and Rationale

- Systematic evaluation of advising _N_

The institution provides advising with professional advisors, faculty mentors, and wrap-around services (e.g., Student Support Services through Trio). New advisors are trained, and all advisors have an advising manual. The manual provided is dated 2019-20, so a current manual was requested in late March but was not received by the date of this report. For the Year 7 report, the institution should attach the current advisor manual or provide a statement that the 2019-20 manual is indeed the current one. Neither the report nor its supporting documents provide a description or evidence that systematic evaluation of advising occurs. This evaluation should be clearly documented in the Year 7 report.

Response to Committee Findings

The advising manual will be updated during the 2024-25 academic year, with the updated version replacing the 2019-20 version effective fall 2025. The position of assistant director for advisor training and education was filled April 1, 2024, and that individual will coordinate the manual updates.

In 2023-24, UO completed a comprehensive review of academic advising objectives, standards, and milestones. Representatives from each advising office and associate deans with stewardship for undergraduate programs have worked with Undergraduate Education and Student Success to develop advising objectives and milestones that apply for all first-year undergraduate students (See [Advising Milestones Student Version](#)). The advising assessment work group will reconvene in fall 2024 to continue building out instruments for all students at all stages of their degree. The milestones will serve as the basis of the systematic advising assessment plan. Advising assessment will occur at two distinct times during the year. Incoming students will complete a short assessment of their initial advising and academic onboarding experience during their in-person orientation experience during the summer by completing the [UO Academic Experience Survey 2024](#). Additionally, all undergraduates will receive an advising assessment survey during winter term (beginning winter 2025). Additionally, all undergraduates will receive an advising assessment survey during winter term (beginning Winter 2025).

Standard 2.G.7

The institution maintains an effective identity verification process for students, including those enrolled in distance education courses and programs, to establish that the student enrolled in such a course or program is the same person whose achievements are evaluated and credentialed. The institution ensures that the identity verification process for distance education students protects student privacy and that students are informed, in writing at the time of enrollment, of current and projected charges associated with the identity verification process.

Note: Institutions should refer to NWCCU Distance Education Policy for guidance and definitions related to the required evidence.

Committee Finding and Rationale

- Policies/procedures make it clear that these processes protect student privacy _N_
- Notification to students at the time of registration of any additional charges associated with verification procedures _N_
- Academic policies/procedures for instructors to implement requirements for regular and substantive interaction in distance education courses/programs _N_

The institution requires students in online courses or programs to use their institutional single sign-on credentials which are provided upon admission to the institution. For students living near campus, exams must be proctored on campus. For students at a distance, they must arrange for remote proctoring in their vicinity. Institutional policies were not found, so the panel could not verify that students are notified of any additional charges for distance education when they register for such courses or programs, nor could the panel verify that instructors must implement requirements for regular and substantive interaction with distance education students.

Response to Committee Findings

- Policies/procedures make it clear that these processes protect student privacy.

There is no additional charge for identify verification. Students admitted to the UO are given access

to university computing resources, including the Canvas learning management system. Following [UO Policy on Acceptable Use of Computing Resources](#), students are required to create and maintain a unique personal username and password for privacy and security, and they are prohibited from sharing accounts or passwords.

- Notification to students at the time of registration of any additional charges associated with verification procedures.

[On-campus proctoring](#) is the norm. There are no additional charges for this service.

Policies for [remote proctoring](#) state that fees associated with whatever remote proctor the student chooses are the student's responsibility.

- Academic policies/procedures for instructors to implement requirements for regular and substantive interaction in distance education courses/programs.

UO policy on [Online Course Requirements](#) includes requirements for regular and substantive interaction.

Standard 2.I.1

Consistent with its mission, the institution creates and maintains physical facilities and technology infrastructure that are accessible, safe, secure, and sufficient in quantity and quality to ensure healthful learning and working environments that support and sustain the institution's mission, academic programs, and services.

Committee Finding and Rationale

- Technology master plan and planning processes _N_

The institution's equipment replacement policy is dated 1986 with a note that the policy number was revised in 2010. The wording seemed relevant still, but because the policy does not indicate the date it was last reviewed, it leaves the impression that the policy has not been reviewed since at least 2010. To assess sufficiency of physical facilities, the institution has policies and procedures related to campus planning as well as physical, environmental, and technological security. An accessibility policy applies to web-based content and information. Policies, procedures, and manuals demonstrate the institution's adherence to this standard with regard to hazardous waste and materials. A technology master plan and/or planning process were not found.

Response to Committee Findings

IT Strategic Plan: [Information Services Strategic Plan Final v1.0.pdf](#)

IS Tactics and Goals Tracker: [IS Tactics and Goals Tracker Latest 202402.xlsx](#)

Progress on that Plan: [All-Staff 20240221 Strategic Plan Progress.pdf](#)

Digital Accessibility: [Digital Accessibility Updated 2024 for Accreditation.docx](#)

An equal-opportunity, affirmative-action institution committed to cultural diversity and compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act.

© 2024 University of Oregon

